



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/728,358	12/03/2003	Tianyi Liao	LP 4820 US NA	6394
43693	7590	08/28/2006	EXAMINER	
INVISTA NORTH AMERICA S.A.R.L. THREE LITTLE FALLS CENTRE/1052 2801 CENTERVILLE ROAD WILMINGTON, DE 19808			PIZIALI, ANDREW T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1771	

DATE MAILED: 08/28/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/728,358

Applicant(s)

LIAO, TIANYI

Examiner

Andrew T. Piziali

Art Unit

1771

— The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address —
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 May 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 9-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 9-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 03 December 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The amendment filed on 5/3/2006 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 9-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 3,940,917 to Strachan in view of USPN 5,896,634 to Brodowski et al. (hereinafter referred to as Brodowski).

Regarding claims 9-20, Strachan discloses a composite yarn comprising at least one elastomeric fiber forming a strand with a total draft in a range from 1.2X to 6.2X of an original spun length of the strand; at least one hard yarn selected from the group consisting of: synthetic fibers, natural fibers and a blend of synthetic and natural fibers, wherein said hard yarn is aligned adjacent and substantially parallel to said strand to make an aligned yarn (see entire document including column 2, lines 3-68 and column 5, lines 32-39).

Strachan discloses that a size material should not be applied prior to the entangling process, but Strachan discloses that certain finishes may be applied which do not prevent the hard yarns from opening during the entanglement process (column 6, lines 52-59). Strachan also discloses that when a lower tension is applied to the composite yarn the feeding of the yarn into the knitting or weaving may be impaired and the fabric quality may be degraded (paragraph

Art Unit: 1771

bridging columns 7 and 8). Considering that Brodowski discloses that it is known in the art to apply a size material to a composite yarn to result in easy weavability (see column 1, lines 45-68), it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply a size material to the composite yarn of Strachan, after the entangling process, because the size material allows for easy weavability of the composite yarn.

Regarding claim 10, Strachan discloses that the elastomeric strand may be a spandex yarn of a denier of from 20 to 140 before stretching and that the hard yarn may have a total denier of from 45 to 900 (see Examples).

Regarding claim 11, Brodowski discloses that a wax may be added to the sizing agent to further improve weavability (column 1, lines 45-67).

Regarding claim 12, Brodowski does not specifically disclose that the sizing agent is applied as a coating, but the examiner takes Official Notice that sizing agents are conventionally applied as coatings.

Regarding claims 13-20, Strachan discloses that the composite yarns may be used to form woven fabrics or knitted fabrics (column 1, lines 12-25) and that the composite yarns may be knit on one bar and hard yarns may be knit on the other (column 10, lines 20-62). Strachan specifically discloses that the particular fabric character and aesthetics will depend on the geometry (column 10, lines 41-48). Absent a showing of unexpected results, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use composite yarns and/or hard yarns in the warp and/or weft yarns of a woven or elastic fabric, in a ratio of from 1:1 to 1:4, because it is understood by one of ordinary skill in the art that the structure of the woven fabric directly affects the cost of the fabric, the fabric character, and the

Art Unit: 1771

aesthetics, and because it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art.

Regarding claims 17-20, Brodowski discloses that the size material is washed away after final finishing (bare strands) (column 1, lines 45-67). Strachan discloses that the yarns may not be twisted (paragraph bridging columns 3 and 4).

Regarding claims 18 and 20, Strachan discloses that the fabric may be used as a garment (column 11, lines 11-22).

4. Claims 9-10 and 12-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 3,940,917 to Strachan in view of Japanese Patent No. 4 733 754 to Nakatomi et al. (hereinafter referred to as Nakatomi).

Regarding claims 9-10 and 12-20, Strachan discloses a composite yarn comprising at least one elastomeric fiber forming a strand with a total draft in a range from 1.2X to 6.2X of an original spun length of the strand; at least one hard yarn selected from the group consisting of: synthetic fibers, natural fibers and a blend of synthetic and natural fibers, wherein said hard yarn is aligned adjacent and substantially parallel to said strand to make an aligned yarn (see entire document including column 2, lines 3-68 and column 5, lines 32-39).

Strachan discloses that a size material should not be applied prior to the entangling process, but Strachan discloses that certain finishes may be applied which do not prevent the hard yarns from opening during the entanglement process (column 6, lines 52-59). Strachan also discloses that when a lower tension is applied to the composite yarn the feeding of the yarn into the knitting or weaving may be impaired and the fabric quality may be degraded (paragraph bridging columns 7 and 8). Considering that Nakatomi discloses that it is known in the art to

Art Unit: 1771

apply a size material to a composite yarn to result in easy weavability (see entire document), it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply a size material to the composite yarn of Strachan, after the entangling process, because the size material allows for easy weavability of the composite yarn.

Regarding claim 10, Strachan discloses that the elastomeric strand may be a spandex yarn of a denier of from 20 to 140 before stretching and that the hard yarn may have a total denier of from 45 to 900 (see Examples).

Regarding claim 12, Nakatomi does not specifically disclose that the sizing agent is applied as a coating, but the examiner takes Official Notice that sizing agents are conventionally applied as coatings.

Regarding claims 13-20, Strachan discloses that the composite yarns may be used to form woven fabrics or knitted fabrics (column 1, lines 12-25) and that the composite yarns may be knit on one bar and hard yarns may be knit on the other (column 10, lines 20-62). Strachan specifically discloses that the particular fabric character and aesthetics will depend on the geometry (column 10, lines 41-48). Absent a showing of unexpected results, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use composite yarns and/or hard yarns in the warp and/or weft yarns of a woven or elastic fabric, in a ratio of from 1:1 to 1:4, because it is understood by one of ordinary skill in the art that the structure of the woven fabric directly affects the cost of the fabric, the fabric character, and the aesthetics, and because it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art.

Art Unit: 1771

Regarding claims 17-20, Nakatomi discloses that the PVA material is washed away after final finishing (bare strands) (column 1, lines 45-67). Strachan discloses that the yarns may not be twisted (paragraph bridging columns 3 and 4).

Regarding claims 18 and 20, Strachan discloses that the fabric may be used as a garment (column 11, lines 11-22).

5. Claims 9-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 3,940,917 to Strachan in view of USPN 3,719,664 to Hayes et al. (hereinafter referred to as Hayes).

Regarding claims 9-16, Strachan discloses a composite yarn comprising at least one elastomeric fiber forming a strand with a total draft in a range from 1.2X to 6.2X of an original spun length of the strand; at least one hard yarn selected from the group consisting of: synthetic fibers, natural fibers and a blend of synthetic and natural fibers, wherein said hard yarn is aligned adjacent and substantially parallel to said strand to make an aligned yarn (see entire document including column 2, lines 3-68 and column 5, lines 32-39).

Strachan discloses that a size material should not be applied prior to the entangling process, but Strachan discloses that certain finishes may be applied which do not prevent the hard yarns from opening during the entanglement process (column 6, lines 52-59). Strachan also discloses that when a lower tension is applied to the composite yarn the feeding of the yarn into the knitting or weaving may be impaired and the fabric quality may be degraded (paragraph bridging columns 7 and 8). Considering that Hayes discloses that it is known in the art to apply a size material to a yarn to result in easy weavability (column 1, lines 5-43), it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply a size

Art Unit: 1771

material to the composite yarn of Strachan, after the entangling process, because the size material allows for easy weavability of the composite yarn.

Regarding claim 10, Strachan discloses that the elastomeric strand may be a spandex yarn of a denier of from 20 to 140 before stretching and that the hard yarn may have a total denier of from 45 to 900 (see Examples).

Regarding claim 12, Hayes discloses that the sizing agent is applied as a coating (column 1, lines 26-43).

Regarding claims 13-16, Strachan discloses that the composite yarns may be used to form woven fabrics or knitted fabrics (column 1, lines 12-25) and that the composite yarns may be knit on one bar and hard yarns may be knit on the other (column 10, lines 20-62). Strachan specifically discloses that the particular fabric character and aesthetics will depend on the geometry (column 10, lines 41-48). Absent a showing of unexpected results, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use composite yarns and/or hard yarns in the warp and/or weft yarns of a woven or elastic fabric, in a ratio of from 1:1 to 1:4, because it is understood by one of ordinary skill in the art that the structure of the woven fabric directly affects the cost of the fabric, the fabric character, and the aesthetics, and because it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art.

6. Claims 13-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 3,940,917 to Strachan in view of USPN 5,896,634 to Brodowski as applied to claims 9-20 above, and further in view of USPN 3,867,242 to Miller.

Regarding claims 13-20, Strachan discloses that the composite yarns may be used to form

Art Unit: 1771

woven fabrics or knitted fabrics (column 1, lines 12-25) and that the composite yarns may be knit on one bar and hard yarns may be knit on the other (column 10, lines 20-62). Strachan specifically discloses that the particular fabric character and aesthetics will depend on the geometry (column 10, lines 41-48). Strachan does not specifically mention the use of composite yarns and hard yarns in the warp and/or weft direction, but Miller discloses that it is known in the art to alternate elastomeric and non-elastomeric fibers (1:1 ratio) in the warp and/or weft direction to produce the desired fabric characteristics (see entire document including the paragraph bridging columns 4 and 5). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use composite yarns and/or hard yarns in the warp and/or weft yarns of a woven or elastic fabric, in a ratio of from 1:1, because it is understood by one of ordinary skill in the art that the structure of the woven fabric directly affects the cost of the fabric, the fabric character, and the aesthetics, and because it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art.

Regarding claims 17-20, Brodowski discloses that the size material is washed away after final finishing (bare strands) (column 1, lines 45-67). Strachan discloses that the yarns may not be twisted (paragraph bridging columns 3 and 4).

Regarding claims 18 and 20, Strachan discloses that the fabric may be used as a garment (column 11, lines 11-22).

7. Claims 13-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 3,940,917 to Strachan in view of Japanese Patent No. 4 733 754 to Nakatomi as applied to claims 9-10 and 12-20 above, and further in view of USPN 3,867,242 to Miller.

Regarding claims 13-20, Strachan discloses that the composite yarns may be used to form

Art Unit: 1771

woven fabrics or knitted fabrics (column 1, lines 12-25) and that the composite yarns may be knit on one bar and hard yarns may be knit on the other (column 10, lines 20-62). Strachan specifically discloses that the particular fabric character and aesthetics will depend on the geometry (column 10, lines 41-48). Strachan does not specifically mention the use of composite yarns and hard yarns in the warp and/or weft direction, but Miller discloses that it is known in the art to alternate elastomeric and non-elastomeric fibers (1:1 ratio) in the warp and/or weft direction to produce the desired fabric characteristics (see entire document including the paragraph bridging columns 4 and 5). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use composite yarns and/or hard yarns in the warp and/or weft yarns of a woven or elastic fabric, in a ratio of from 1:1, because it is understood by one of ordinary skill in the art that the structure of the woven fabric directly affects the cost of the fabric, the fabric character, and the aesthetics, and because it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art.

Regarding claims 17-20, Nakatomi discloses that the PVA material is washed away after final finishing (bare strands) (column 1, lines 45-67). Strachan discloses that the yarns may not be twisted (paragraph bridging columns 3 and 4).

Regarding claims 18 and 20, Strachan discloses that the fabric may be used as a garment (column 11, lines 11-22).

8. Claims 13-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 3,940,917 to Strachan in view of USPN 3,719,664 to Hayes as applied to claims 9-16 above, and further in view of USPN 3,867,242 to Miller.

Regarding claims 13-16, Strachan discloses that the composite yarns may be used to form

Art Unit: 1771

woven fabrics or knitted fabrics (column 1, lines 12-25) and that the composite yarns may be knit on one bar and hard yarns may be knit on the other (column 10, lines 20-62). Strachan specifically discloses that the particular fabric character and aesthetics will depend on the geometry (column 10, lines 41-48). Strachan does not specifically mention the use of composite yarns and hard yarns in the warp and/or weft direction, but Miller discloses that it is known in the art to alternate elastomeric and non-elastomeric fibers (1:1 ratio) in the warp and/or weft direction to produce the desired fabric characteristics (see entire document including the paragraph bridging columns 4 and 5). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use composite yarns and/or hard yarns in the warp and/or weft yarns of a woven or elastic fabric, in a ratio of from 1:1, because it is understood by one of ordinary skill in the art that the structure of the woven fabric directly affects the cost of the fabric, the fabric character, and the aesthetics, and because it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed 11/14/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant cites a dictionary definition of the word "align" wherein the definition is "to put (two or more things) into a straight line." The applicant also cites another dictionary wherein the definition is "to bring into a line or alignment." The applicant fails to clearly state which definition is appropriate for the current application, but considering that the current claims specifically state that the hard yarn is aligned adjacent and substantially parallel to the strand, it is clear that the first definition (straight line) is not appropriate because the claim allows for the

Art Unit: 1771

hard yarn to be aligned less than perfectly straight with the strand. Therefore, the second definition is appropriate and the current claims are interpreted, and have been interpreted, to define a hard yarn that is brought into a line with an elastomeric strand.

The applicant asserts that Strachan does not teach or suggest a hard yarn aligned (brought into a line) adjacent to an elastomeric strand. The applicant asserts that Strachan does not teach or suggest that the elastomeric strand and the hard yarn form a line. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Figure 3 of Strachan clearly illustrates the hard yarn (20) aligned (brought into a line) adjacent to the elastomeric strand (1). The elastomeric strand and the hard yarn clearly form a line in Figure 3. The composite yarn is formed by a point moving along a fixed direction and the reverse direction (see cited dictionary definition of the word "line").

The applicant asserts that Strachan "arguably" teaches a hard yarn aligned adjacent and "substantially parallel" to an elastomeric strand. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Strachan clearly discloses that the hard yarn is aligned "substantially parallel" with the strand (column 2, lines 10-19).

The applicant asserts that Strachan completely teaches away from the use of a size material. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Strachan discloses that a size material should not be applied prior to the entangling process, but Strachan discloses that certain finishes may be applied which do not prevent the hard yarns from opening during the entanglement process (column 6, lines 52-59). Strachan also discloses that when a lower tension is applied to the composite yarn, the feeding of the yarn into the knitting or weaving may be impaired and the fabric quality may be degraded (paragraph bridging columns 7 and 8). Considering that Brodowski, Nakatomi, and Hayes each disclose that it is known in the art to apply a size material

Art Unit: 1771

to a composite yarn to result in easy weavability, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply a size material to the composite yarn of Strachan, after the entangling process, because the size material allows for easy weavability of the composite yarn.

Conclusion

10. This new application is a continuing application (RCE) of an earlier application. All claims of the new application are drawn to the same invention claimed in the earlier application and would have been properly finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in the next Office action if they had been entered in the earlier application. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL** even though it is a first action in this case. See MPEP § 706.07(b). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

11. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no, however, event will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.


Art Unit: 1771

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew T. Piziali whose telephone number is (571) 272-1541. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:00-4:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Terrel Morris can be reached on (571) 272-1478. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

atp

 5/9/06
ANDREW T. PIZIALI
PATENT EXAMINER